

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 20, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-13 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. New claims 14-19 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langlet (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,248) in view of Wallentin (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,911), and further in view of Endo (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,610). The Office Action took the position that Langlet discloses all of the elements of the present claims, with the exception of allocating in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call, and controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto. The Office Action then cited Wallentin and Endo as allegedly curing these deficiencies in Langlet. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2 and 3 are dependent, recites a method which includes arranging, in a mobile system between a base station controller and base stations, telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station. The method further includes allocating in call set-up at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call, and controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto.

Claim 12 recites an apparatus including a communicating unit for a base station controller configured to communicate with base stations via a plurality of optional telecommunication channels, which are not permanently allocated to any base station, between the base station controller and the base stations. The base station controller further includes a controller for a base station controller configured to allocate in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base station to a base station for a call and to transmit a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to whom the channel is allocated.

Claim 13 recites a system comprising base stations and telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station, between a base station controller and the base stations. The system

also includes allocating means for allocating in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call, and controlling means for controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base stations allocated thereto.

Embodiments of the present invention provide for an efficient utilization of telecommunication channels between the base station and the base station controller. Channel allocation may be performed call-specifically in order to improve the degree of utilization of the channels. As such, a given telecommunication channel may only be allocated for the duration of the call to a transceiver unit of the base station handling the call. When the call terminates, the telecommunication channel may be released and it can be freely allocated to another transceiver unit. The same telecommunication channel can thus be allocated call-specifically to various base stations. Thus, a pool of unallocated telecommunication channels is formed between the base stations and the base station controller; from which pool the base station controller allocates a free channel call-specifically to the base station that needs a channel for handling a call at a given time (Specification, page 2, line 34 – page 3, line 11).

As will be discussed below, the combination of Langlet, Wallentin and Endo fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the advantages and features discussed above.

Langlet discloses a communication system which provides communication coverage over radio frequency channels that are subdivided into a plurality of time slots during which information are communicated with at least one mobile unit. The system includes a base station that is linked to a mobile unit via one or more of the radio frequency channels. The base station includes a plurality of space and/or polarization diversity antennas, for transmitting the information on multicast and non-multicast channels. The non-multicast channels are time slots during which the information is transmitted from only one of the antennas, and the multicast channels are the time slots during which the same information is transmitted from more than one of the antennas. A controller allocates the multicast and non-multicast channels based on a measure of the propagation property of the radio frequency channels that link the mobile unit to the base station.

Wallentin discloses that, in a mobile radio communications system supporting communications with plural mobile radio units, each of several base stations includes plural radio transceivers and a common controller. The common controller assigns radio channels to ones of the transceivers. A switching controller is coupled to the base stations and controls communications involving the radio units. The switching controller transmits a control message to a selected one or more of the base stations. The control message identifies plural channels associated with the selected base station. The common controller in the selected base station distributes the control message to each of the identified channels for radio transmission.

Endo discloses transmission power control with dynamic step value depending on a location of a mobile terminal in a radio zone. The mobile terminal detects its location, whether close to a radio base station, a boundary of the radio zone, or an intermediate location, by an intensity of reception field strength of a radio signal transmitted by a radio base station. The radio base station, which has received and measured the radio signal quality transmitted by the mobile terminal, instructs the transmission power control information (increasing or decreasing) to the mobile terminal in accordance with the measured radio signal quality. When “decreasing” instructions are received repeatedly at the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal is located near the radio base station, a larger step value than a normal case is used for decreasing transmission power of the mobile terminal. When “increasing” instructions are received repeatedly at the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal is located in the boundary of the radio zone, a larger step value than the normal case is used for increasing transmission power of the mobile terminal.

Applicants respectfully submit that Langlet, Wallentin and Endo, whether considered individually or combined, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the present claims. For example, the combination of Langlet, Wallentin and Endo fails to disclose or suggest “telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station,” “allocating in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call,” and “controlling the base station

controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto,” as recited in claims 1 and 13, and the similar limitations recited in claim 12.

The Office Action alleges that Langlet discloses telecommunication channels between a base station controller and base stations, and which are available for a plurality of base stations but not allocated to any base station. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action again refers to multicasting and multicast channels mentioned in Column 5, lines 62 - 65 and Column 13, lines 7 - 12 of Langlet. Multicasting is explained on Column 2, lines 5-10 of Langlet as follows: *"Most conventional multicasting techniques employ two or more separated antennas at each base station, to transmit the same messages over the same coverage area. The messages are multicasted either simultaneously or with some offset in time."* Clearly the multicast channels referred to by the Office Action are radio frequency channels between the base station and the mobile station, and not telecommunication channels between a base station controller and base stations, as recited in the present claims. Therefore, Langlet fails to disclose or suggest telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station. Wallentin and Endo, as acknowledged by the Office Action, also do not disclose this feature of the claims.

The Office Action further alleges that Wallentin teaches allocating in call set-up at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call. Applicants respectfully disagree. The section of Wallentin to which the Office Action refers (Wallentin, Column 4 lines 55 - 65) relates to radio channels between the base station and mobile station and not to channels between the base station controller and the base stations. This is clear when considering the entire paragraph, on Column 4 of Wallentin, to which the Examiner refers. Specifically, “manages radio communications” is mentioned on lines 52-53 of Column 4. In addition, it is explained on lines 58 - 63 of Column 4 that a paging message is transmitted “via the air interface 40 over a control channel” and that when a mobile station sends an acknowledgement over the control channel, a traffic channel is assigned. Clearly this traffic channel substitutes the control channel over the air interface which has initially been used between the mobile station and the base station. Therefore, Wallentin fails to disclose or suggest allocating in call set-up at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call. Langlet and Endo, as acknowledged in the Office Action, also fail to disclose or suggest this element of the claims.

The Office Action further argues that Endo teaches controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station on the telecommunication channel allocated thereto. Applicants note that the claims clearly define that the information indicates for the base station the allocated channel between the base station controller and

the base station. Such a solution is not disclosed by Endo. Instead, Endo only refers to data transmission between a base station and a control apparatus (Endo, Column 4, lines 56-60). Endo does not disclose or suggest transmitting information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto. Langlet and Wallentin, as acknowledged by the Office Action, also fail to disclose this feature of the claims.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Langlet, Wallentin and Endo fails to disclose or suggest “telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station,” “allocating in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call,” and “controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto,” as recited in claims 1 and 13, and the similar limitations recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langlet in view of Wallentin, and further in view of Endo and Choi (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,740). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Langlet, Wallentin, and Endo are discussed above. Choi discloses a CDMA communication system for transmitting/receiving control information during a voice or

data communication service by using a dedicated control channel. The system includes a base station device and a terminal device. The base station device has a forward pilot channel generator for generating a pilot signal, a forward dedicated control channel generator for generating a control message for a forward dedicated control channel, a forward fundamental channel generator for generating a voice signal, and a forward supplemental channel generator for generating packet data. The terminal device includes a reverse dedicated control channel generator for generating a control message for a reverse dedicated control channel, a reverse pilot channel generator for generating a pilot signal by adding a power control signal to the pilot signal, a reverse fundamental channel generator for generating a voice signal, and a reverse supplemental channel generator for generating packet data.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent upon claim 1, and inherit all of the limitations thereof. As discussed above, Langlet, Wallentin, and Endo fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Choi fails to cure the deficiencies in Langlet, Wallentin, and Endo, as Choi also does not disclose or suggest “telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station,” “allocating in call set-up at least one of said telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call,” and “controlling the base station controller to transmit information to the base station to indicate for the base station the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the base station allocated thereto.” Therefore, the combination of

Langlet, Wallentin, Endo and Choi does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 and 3. Furthermore, claims 2 and 3 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claim 1, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 4, 7, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langlet in view of Kanai (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,566), and further in view of Wallentin and Kallin (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,592). The Office Action took the position that Langlet discloses all of the elements of the claims, with the exception of: a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of said plurality of optional telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations, the base station controller comprises a controller which in call set-up allocates at least one of said telecommunication channels between said base station controller and said base stations to the first or the second base station for the call and which transmit a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to whom the channel is allocated, and the switching unit of the first, and correspondingly, of the second base station are responsive to said message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by said message. The Office Action then cited Kanai, Wallentin, and Kallin as allegedly curing these deficiencies in Langlet. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 4, upon which claims 5-8 are dependent, recites a system including a base station controller, a plurality of optional telecommunication channels which are not

permanently allocated to any base station and are available between the base station controller and base stations, and at least a first and a second base station. The base stations comprise transceiver units configured to establish a telecommunication connection by radio signals to the subscriber terminals located in the base station coverage area and a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of the plurality of optional telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations. The base station controller comprises a controller which, in call set-up, allocates at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the first or the second base station for the call and which transmit a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to which the channel is allocated. The switching unit of the first, and correspondingly, of the second base station are responsive to the message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by the message.

Claim 9, upon which claim 10 is dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes transceiver units configured to establish a telecommunication connection by radio signals to subscriber terminals located in a coverage area of the apparatus. The apparatus further includes a switching unit configured to connect the transceiver units in call set-up to a base station controller via particular channels of a plurality of optional telecommunication channels, available between the base station controller and base stations of the system, which are not permanently allocated to any base station. The

switching unit is responsive to a message received by the apparatus in conjunction with the call set-up for switching a particular transceiver unit onto the telecommunication channel between the base station controller and the apparatus indicated by the message for the call.

Claim 11 recites an apparatus which includes means for a base station controller for communicating with base stations via a plurality of optional telecommunication channels, which are not permanently allocated to any base station, between the apparatus and the base stations. The apparatus also includes control means for a base station controller for allocating, in call set-up, at least one of the telecommunication channels between the apparatus and the base stations to a base station for a call and for transmitting a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to whom the channel is allocated.

As will be discussed below, Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin, whether viewed individually or combined, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fail to provide the features discussed above.

Langlet and Wallentin are discussed above. Kanai discloses a cellular radio communication system utilizing integrated base stations. The system includes a cell containing a first base station with conventional transceivers and base station facilities, and the antenna of a second base station facility. The first base station facility is made up of a group of base stations facilities where the equipment is integrated, while the second base station is a conventional local base station. A transceiver may have unused capacity

and a caller with a low priority may not be assigned to the transceiver even though capacity is available. Instead, the capacity is kept available for a caller with a higher priority. Traffic monitors are used by portable telephone providers to manage the traffic in every cell, and traffic can be assigned to the transceiver based on the provider with the highest volume or according to a prearranged priority scale.

Kallin discloses a method and system for controlling overhead information transmission in a radio communication system. When messages are broadcast by the system which may cause mobile stations to attempt system access, these messages are sent on streams A and B at offset rather than adjacent times so as to desynchronize the reception of these messages by even and odd numbered mobile identification number mobile stations. In this way, the load on the reverse control channel is spread out over time rather than being clumped to reduce the possibility of overload in response to any particular transmission on the overhead message trains.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims. For instance, the combination of Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin fails to disclose or suggest “telecommunication channels, which are not permanently allocated to any base station, available between said base station controller and base stations,” “a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of said plurality of optional telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations,” “the base station controller comprises a controller which in call set-up

allocates at least one of said telecommunication channels between said base station controller and said base stations to the first or the second base station for the call and which transmit a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to whom the channel is allocated,” and “the switching unit of the first, and correspondingly, of the second base station are responsive to said message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by said message,” as recited in claim 4, and the similar limitations recited in claims 9 and 11.

As mentioned above, the Office Action alleges that Langlet discloses telecommunication channels between a base station controller and base stations, and which are available for a plurality of base stations but not allocated to any base station. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action again refers to multicasting and multicast channels mentioned in Column 5, lines 62 - 65 and Column 13, lines 7 - 12 of Langlet. Multicasting is explained on Column 2, lines 5-10 of Langlet as follows: “*Most conventional multicasting techniques employ two or more separated antennas at each base station, to transmit the same messages over the same coverage area. The messages are multicasted either simultaneously or with some offset in time.*” Clearly the multicast channels referred to by the Office Action are radio frequency channels between the base station and the mobile station, and not telecommunication channels between a base station controller and base stations, as recited in the present claims. Therefore, Langlet fails to

disclose or suggest telecommunication channels which are available for a plurality of base stations but not permanently allocated to any base station. Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin fail to cure this deficiency in Langlet.

The Office Action also alleges that Kanai teaches a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of a plurality of optional channels between a base station controller and base stations. In the cited sections of Kanai (Fig. 1, BSC102, Controller 130 and Switching devices 105), however, the switching means 105 is between the transceivers 104 and the antenna means in the base station, and, therefore, totally incapable of carrying out switching among telecommunication channels between the base station controller 102 and the base station. Kanai, therefore, fails to disclose or suggest a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of said plurality of optional telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations. Langlet, Wallentin and Kallin also fail to cure this deficiency in Kanai.

The Office Action further alleges that Wallentin teaches allocating in call set-up at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, the section of Wallentin to which the Office Action refers (Wallentin, Column 4 lines 55 - 65) relates to radio channels between the base station and mobile station and not to channels between the base station controller and the base stations. This is clear when considering the entire paragraph, on Column 4 of Wallentin, to which the

Examiner refers. Specifically, “manages radio communications” is mentioned on lines 52-53 of Column 4. In addition, it is explained on lines 58 - 63 of Column 4 that a paging message is transmitted “via the air interface 40 over a control channel” and that when a mobile station sends an acknowledgement over the control channel, a traffic channel is assigned. Clearly this traffic channel substitutes the control channel over the air interface which has initially been used between the mobile station and the base station. Therefore, Wallentin fails to disclose or suggest allocating in call set-up at least one of the telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations to the base station handling the call. Langlet, Kanai and Kallin, as acknowledged in the Office Action, also fail to disclose or suggest this element of the claims.

The Office Action further argues that Kallin discloses the switching unit of the first and second base station, which is responsive to said message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by said message. In this connection, Applicants note that “said” message is, according to the claim wording, a message from a base station controller that indicates an allocated channel between the base station controller and the base station to the base station. The section of Kallin, referred to by the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest such a solution. Instead, Kallin only discloses an exchange (MSC) that allocates a radio channel between a mobile station and a base station. Therefore, Kallin fails to disclose or suggest “the switching unit of the first, and correspondingly, of the second base station are responsive to said message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by

said message.” Langlet, Kanai and Wallentin, as acknowledged by the Office Action, also fail to disclose or suggest this limitation of the claims.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to provide a *prima facie* case for obviousness. It is well established in U.S. patent law that a piecemeal analysis of a number of references, to extract a number of individual elements which are picked and chosen to recreate the claimed invention, is improper absent some teaching or suggestion in the references to support their use in the particular claimed combination. It is improper to look to the Applicant’s own disclosure for any such motivation or incentive. (*Interconnect Planning Corporation v. Feil*, 227 USPQ 543 (Fed. Cir. 1985). There is no motivation or teaching in any of the references that indicates that these references could or should be combined, or in case they are any way combined, which features should be picked from which reference. Applicants submit that the Office Action is using improper hindsight reasoning is combining the references, since the only motivation to combine the references is gleaned from the present application. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious and the rejection of the claims is improper.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that the combination of Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin fails to disclose or suggest “telecommunication channels, which are not permanently allocated to any base station, available between said base station controller and base stations,” “a switching unit configured to switch the base station transceiver units onto a particular channel of said

plurality of optional telecommunication channels between the base station controller and the base stations,” “the base station controller comprises a controller which in call set-up allocates at least one of said telecommunication channels between said base station controller and said base stations to the first or the second base station for the call and which transmit a predetermined message indicating the allocated telecommunication channel to the base station to whom the channel is allocated,” and “the switching unit of the first, and correspondingly, of the second base station are responsive to said message for switching the base station transceiver units to the telecommunication channel assigned by said message,” as recited in claim 4, and the similar limitations recited in claims 9 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 9, and 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 10 are dependent upon claims 4 and 9, respectively. As such, claims 7 and 10 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 4 and 9, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langlet in view of Kanai, and further in view of Wallentin, Kallin, and Choi. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 and 6 are dependent upon claim 4. As discussed above, Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin, and Kallin fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 4. Choi does not cure the deficiencies in Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin, as Choi also fails to disclose or suggest the telecommunication channels, switching unit and controller, as

recited in claim 4. Hence, the combination of Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin, Kallin, and Choi do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 5 and 6. Further, claims 5 and 6 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claim 4, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

In addition, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 is based on improper hindsight reasoning as discussed above. Applicants assert that the Office Action is using improper hindsight reasoning is combining the references, since the only motivation to combine the references is gleaned from the present application. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious and the rejection of the claims is improper.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langlet in view of Kanai, and further in view of Wallentin, Kallin, and Lu (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,256). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin are discussed above. Lu discloses a method for facilitating cellular communication for a plurality of native cellular handsets in a hybrid cellular communication network which includes a cellular exchange subsystem and a private mobile-services switching center. The cellular exchange subsystem is coupled to a public cellular, and the native cellular handsets are handsets that subscribe to the hybrid cellular communication network. The hybrid cellular communication network also facilitates cellular communication between a non-native cellular handset and the public cellular network, where the non-native cellular handsets are handsets that do not

subscribe to the hybrid cellular communication network. Access request data is received and a cellular exchange subsystem is used to determine whether the access request data originated from a native cellular handset or from a non-native cellular handset. If the access request data originated from a native cellular handset, then data relating to the access request is passed to the private mobile-services switching center for completing a first call path from the native cellular handset. If the access request data originated from a non-native cellular handset, then data relating to the access request data is passed to the public cellular network for completing a second call path between the non-native cellular handset and the public cellular network.

Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 4. As discussed above, Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin, and Kallin fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 4. Lu does not cure the deficiencies in Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin and Kallin, as Lu also fails to disclose or suggest the telecommunication channels, switching unit and controller, as recited in claim 4. Hence, the combination of Langlet, Kanai, Wallentin, Kallin, and Lu does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 8. Further, claim 8 should be allowed for at least its dependence upon claim 4, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

In addition, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 8 is based on improper hindsight reasoning as discussed above. Applicants assert that the Office Action is using improper hindsight reasoning is combining the references, since the only motivation to combine the references is gleaned from the present application. Applicants, therefore,

respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious and the rejection of the claims is improper.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-19 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Majid S. AlBassam
Registration No. 54,749

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time